

## Structural Causes of the American Wars Against Iraq 1991-2003

Ihmoud Ali Abusalim\*

### Abstract

This study has unfolded the reality that the United States direct involvement in the Gulf Wars can be characterized as an act of an actor-oriented model that explains the immediate causes of the United States wars against Iraq in 1991 and 2003, which may include economic reasons such as the free flow of oil and its price, and their impact on the United States economy, in addition to other factors such as the security and survival of the State of Israel. However, a structure-oriented model has been used in this study to explore the reality behind the United States future objectives by going to war against Iraq in 1991 and the systematic approach used by the United States after the war to end up with the 2003 invasion of Iraq. An attempt has been made to uncover the fact that the wars were neither fought to oppose aggression nor to protect the principles of the International Law, nor to promote justice, democracy, and stability in the world. Instead, they were fought in a manner to create conditions for a new role for the United States in a new world order following the end of the Cold War, and the United States quest for world hegemony.

**Keywords:** Structural Causes, War, Structur-oriented, actor-oriented, world hegemony, aggression, Invasion.

### الدوافع الهيكلية للحروب الأمريكية ضد العراق 1991-2003

احمود علي أبو سليم

#### ملخص

تعتمد هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل الدوافع المباشرة وغير المباشرة للحرب الأمريكية ضد العراق منذ حرب الخليج الثانية 1991 إلى احتلاله عام 2003، ولتي نتلخص بالدوافع الاقتصادية، تحديدا حرية تدفق النفط للولايات المتحدة، وما قد يترتب عليه من احتمالية لركود الاقتصادي ونتائج السلبية على الاقتصاد الأمريكي ومن ثم الأمن القومي الأمريكي، كدوافع مباشرة، اعتمدت فيها الولايات المتحدة نموذج رد الفعل التلقائي على التهديد العراقي للمصالح الأمريكية في المنطقة والتي تشمل أيضاً الحفاظ على أمن إسرائيل وبقائها، إثر الغزو العراقي للكويت 1990 من جهة، ونموذج للتخطيط المعتمد لدفع العراق لاحتلال الكويت عام 1990، ومن ثم اتباع السبل الممنهجة كافة للضغط على العراق في الفترة التي تلت حرب 1991 حتى تاريخ الاحتلال الأمريكي له عام 2003 وذلك كي يتسنى للولايات المتحدة للتدخل بدوافع معلنة وأخرى غير معلنة والتي يرى الباحث أن الهدف الأساس منه هو فرض السيطرة على نفط المنطقة ومن ثم على مصدر الطاقة العالمي، الأمر الذي يحقق للرغبة الأمريكية في خلق نظام عالمي جديد من خلال إعادة بناء نظام إقليمي يحقق هدف استمرارية الوجود الأمريكي هناك، ومن ثم للتحكم بأهم مصادر الطاقة النفطية بالعالم الأمر الذي يحقق الرغبة الأمريكية في الهيمنة على العالم بعد انفرادها كقوة غير قابلة للتحدي إثر انهيار الاتحاد السوفييتي عام 1991.

**الكلمات الدالة:** الدوافع الهيكلية، الحروب الهيمنة، عدوان، احتلال.

\* قسم العلوم السياسية، جامعة مؤتة، الكرك، الأردن.

تاريخ قبول البحث: 2008/9/10.

تاريخ تقديم البحث: 2008/4/9.

© جميع حقوق النشر محفوظة لجامعة مؤتة، الكرك، للمملكة الأردنية الهاشمية، 2009 .

## Introduction

It is beyond any doubt that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait on August the second 1990, under the former president of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, was a violation of international laws. However, the American allegation that their response to the crisis was to protect the principles of international law, world order, and the charter of the United Nations from aggressions and lawless, was in fact a camouflage and piracy. Many violations of both the United Nations charter and the principles of the International Law have gone in many places in the world without any such response. Such violations have been carried out by the very same states that allied themselves in a coalition (Britain and the United States) to end the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait in 1991, are now proceeding with the same act by invading and occupying Iraq, not to mention Afghanistan. Israel has invaded and still occupies the Golan Heights, the West Bank, and Gaza Strip, and still exercises military control over Southern Lebanon.

Unfortunately, lying and severely criticized allegations are only limited to both United States presidents, George Bush and George W. Bush; the father and the son. No security council resolutions were passed or even proposed to protect President Bush's (the father) new world order from his own violation of the sovereignty of Panama, as did President Reagan when he invaded and occupied Sovereign Grenada, and now, under the presidency of George W. Bush, the American invasion and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq.

As one devastating war succeeded another in this century, one might ask why states continued to engage in such wars when the cost, material and physical, exceeded any possible gain that these wars might bring at the end. The United States involvement in the world affairs has been increasing since World War II until the present time. It exceeded more than 190 interventions. It was from the large scale involvement in World War II to the Korean War, Vietnam War, Latin America, the 1990-1991 Gulf War, and now the American Wars against Afghanistan and Iraq. This involvement, however, may be justified by the United States as its legitimate right to protect its interests. In this case, were the wars against Iraq fought in this manner? Could the war have been avoided without harming the United States interests in the region; and how can someone explain how the wars have been conducted and for what reason?

In an attempt to answer these questions, this study has unfolded the reality that the United States involvement in a hostile situation with Iraq in 1991 and the 2003 wars and its justifications were in fact not an innocent response to an aggression and/or a violation of the International Law. It was structurally designed to be this way in order to set up new rules in the region in which the United States quest for world hegemony will be served. This, however, might explain the immediate and un-immediate causes of the Gulf Wars in 1991 and 2003.

## Purpose of the study

This study will first examine the debate among scholars and theorists of what the main causes of war in general are, and the more applicable theories and/or models used so far to analyze the motives of any states to be involved in a violent or hostile situation

against another state. However, the main purpose of this study will be to explore immediate and un-immediate causes and/or motives of the United States wars against Iraq from the 1991 Gulf War to the 2003 American occupation of Iraq. Immediate economic causes for going to war against Iraq are very well known. Oil has been the most obvious economic reason behind the United States presence in the region at large, and the invasion of Iraq in 2003. However, there are some other motives behind the United States wars against Iraq. These motives might include the United States role in a new world, its quest for world hegemony, and its ambition to spread the American values to be universally accepted by the others by all means necessary including the use of military force, not to mention the protection of Israel's security.

### Research Methodology

What causes war? This is one of the questions that scholars and analysts try to answer. Causes of war can be understood in terms of models analyses. Theoretically there are two basic models that might be used to analyze the causes of war. Johan Galtung (1980) stated that the two basic models are: first, an actor-oriented model that looks for violence carried out by actors including groups and nations. Second, a structure-oriented model that focuses on systematic conditions that are responsible for the occurrence of direct military action.<sup>(1)</sup> On the other hand, efforts have been made by scholars and analysts to answer the question of what causes war by dividing these causes into basic and particular or immediate. These two elements are equivalent to Galtung model analyses.<sup>(2)</sup>

Walters Jones (1988) has defined war as the organized conduct of major armed hostilities between social groups and nations, and categorized fifteen principle causes of war some of them might be applicable for this study which include:

1) Power asymmetries 2) Instinctual aggression 3) Economic and scientific stimulation 4) The military-industrial complex 5) Conflict resolution by force.<sup>(3)</sup>

Hidemi Suganami (1991) "The causes of War: A New Theoretical Framework" in his effort to answer the question of "What causes war?" suggested that, contemporary historical works on war-origins appear to use explicitly, or rely implicitly upon a set of categories such as the following in structuring their narrative content:

(a) an intent, with some end in view even in desperation to force upon the opponent a choice between surrender and war ( ranging from an entirely unprovoked aggressive war to war in response to varying degrees of provocation, including preventive and punitive wars ). (b) Recklessness or risk taking (willful disregard of the apparent likelihood that the course of action taken will eventuate in war). (c)Heedlessness (inadvertently offending or alienating the opponent, thereby giving him a reason to strike). (d) Contributory negligence (failure to take standard precautions against a possible attack or to resort to standard counter-measures against expansion, thereby encouraging the opponent to launch a war). (e) Self-defense (refusal to surrender immediately when confronted with a choice between surrender and war).<sup>(4)</sup>

Within this content, some might add that misleading miscalculation, recklessness, or risk-taking, and heedlessness, are factors that might have contributed much to the

added up causes of war. However, an analytical method, in addition to Galtung's world model analysis of actor-oriented and structure-oriented models will be applied in this study to analyze the reasons behind the American Wars against Iraq from the 1991 Gulf War to the 2003 American invasion of Iraq.

#### Research Questions:

1. What are the immediate causes of the American wars against Iraq?
2. What was the hidden agenda behind the American involvement in the war?
3. Does America structurally design creative chaos in the region?
4. Were the Americans disguising when they said they were fighting aggression in the region, as the case in the 1991 Gulf War? Or were they lying when they said they were fighting terrorism in the region to bring democracy and inspiration there, as the case in the 2003 American occupation of Iraq?
5. Was the war fought to establish a new world order?

#### Development of United States Policy Towards Iraq 1991-2003:

In 1990, when Iraq invaded Kuwait, the United States reaction, as a result had nothing to do with its stated aims of opposing aggression. That was most obvious from the very recent history of the United States relations with Saddam Hussein, during his eight year long war with Iran. Right up to the few days of its invasion of Kuwait, Iraq was enjoying almost a full normalization of its relations with the United States. Cooperation between the two parties was gearing up in almost every aspect, especially since the 1984 United States tilt toward Iraq. However, a sudden shift in United States policy toward Iraq came in 1988 after the end of the Iran-Iraq War. Donald Neff (1991) in his article "How and Why the United States Turned Against Iraq", pointed out that the sudden policy switch from the pro-Iraqi stance the United States had during the Iran-Iraq war came right after the 1988 end of that war. According to Neff, the aftermath of the war shows that Iraq had emerged as the strongest Arab state, with significant military and technological capabilities that posed for the first time a strategic challenge to Israel's superiority in the Middle East. Therefore, it is in the interest of Israel to see the Iraqi military capabilities reduced to the point that it will never pose a threat to the security of Israel.<sup>(5)</sup> As a result; there is no need to point out that the 1991 American War against Iraq had been conducted accordingly. The destruction of Iraq's military machines during the 1991 Gulf War and later by disarming Iraq is in fact accomplishing Israeli aims.

In an analysis to the above mentioned argument, some might ask, has Iraq been used and abused by the Americans since the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq war to 1991 Gulf War and later, the American invasion of Iraq 2003, to serve certain objectives?. In fact it is in the interest of the United States to keep the radical Iran after the 1979 Islamic Revolution under control. Containing and/or confronting Iran by the United States or a state in the region has been in U.S. policy agenda since 1979 based on the fears that the new Iranian radicalism might spread all over the region, in which U.S. strategic interests will be severely damaged. Therefore the Iraqi action against Iran in 1980 have

been welcomed by the United States and most of the Gulf states in order to keep Iran within its borders, and reduced the possibility of gaining control over the Gulf. In this case the eight year long war between Iraq and Iran has been observed by the United States as a proxy war tactic serving the United States objectives in the region.

In addition, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990 was not an unexpected act by the late Saddam Hussein, but it has been used by the United States as an act of "actor-oriented" that looks for violence carried out by actors who in this case was Iraq in its invasion of Kuwait. The American response to the Iraqi action was to launch a new policy in the region through the most distractive war against one nation since World War II. So did Saddam Hussein misread the message, then "walk into a trap"?<sup>(6)</sup>

Actually, The United States was determined to lead the late Saddam Hussein to believe that he might get away by capturing Kuwait. That was very clear from the many statements made by the American officials regarding the United States-Iraq relationships. President Bush himself had been a key figure as vice president during the Regan administration support for Iraq. However after he became president, his policy towards Iraq was confusing and/or a planned strategy to deceive Iraq and to set up a trap for the former president of Iraq, the late Saddam Hussein to act the way he did so the United States will have its justifications of going to war against Iraq.<sup>(7)</sup> Accordingly, President Bush directed his staff to make it clear that the United States has no business with what might occur between the two neighboring Arab countries in the Gulf. His ambassador to Iraq, April Gillespie's interview with Saddam Hussein on July 25<sup>th</sup> 1990, made it clear that the United States has no business to interfere between the two neighboring Arab states. It seems like the Bush administration through out the American Ambassador in Baghdad, Mrs. Gillespie, structurally designed a trap for Saddam Hussein to make him believe that the United States was giving him a green light many times regarding many sensitive issues, like the Iraqi desire to increase the price of oil, after the Iran- Iraq war in 1988, which the United States would agree on. The Ambassador replied during her interview with the late Saddam Hussein that she fully agrees by saying "We have many Americans who would like to see the price go above \$25 because they come from oil-producing states."<sup>(8)</sup>

Despite the Iraq-Kuwait border dispute, the Ambassador in her words said to Saddam Hussein "With regard to all of this, can I ask you to understand how the issue appears to us? My assessment after twenty-five years' service in this area is that your objective must have strong backing from your Arab brothers. I now speak of oil. But you, Mr. President, have fought a horrific and painful war. Frankly, we can see only that you have deployed massive troops in the south. Normally, that would not be any of our business."<sup>(9)</sup> That was another hint to Saddam Hussein to go ahead with what he was actually going to do regarding his dispute with Kuwait. In addition, Assistant Secretary of State for Middle Eastern affairs, John Kelly, on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July, just two days before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, stated to the congress, "We have no defense treaty with any Gulf country." These statements were a clear signal to Saddam Hussein that the United States had nothing to do with this matter.<sup>(10)</sup> Accordingly, Saddam might have miscalculated the American hidden agenda, in fact he has been used and abused by the United States and has fallen in their set trap, believing that he had the

green light to go ahead and occupy Kuwait. So, have the Iraqis been abused in this case?

Therefore, one may ask what the immediate causes of the war against Iraq were. As a matter of fact, the most obvious immediate reason of the American war in 1991 was an economic one. First oil, and second to control a probable recession and its consequences on the United States economy. However, the 1990-1991 Gulf War has ended in a satisfactory manner to the United States announced objectives at the time, which include the liberation of Kuwait, limitation of the Iraqi military capabilities not to be a threat to its neighbors in the future, and the most immediate aim, the free flow of the regions oil. <sup>(11)</sup>

### **Structural Causes of the American Wars against Iraq:**

#### **Introduction:**

It was a dream about to come true. Since the end of the Second World War, the United States appeared to be the unchallenged super power in the world. The Pax Americana, the world hegemony, and/or world leadership were the dream that the United States wanted to achieve. However, in the eyes of much of the world, in general and the Arab masses in particular, America is a nation possessed of an imperial empire which seeks hegemony over other nations. There is more than one kind of empire, more than one way of exercising control over others, and more than one justification for doing so. The United States has intervened massively in the affairs of other nations as a reaction to the old isolationism. This change in the United States global policy from isolationism to interventionism flowed almost from World War II. As a result of this war, the United States became not only a great power, but almost the world power. The extension of the United States power to fill the vacuums created by the decline of Western European influence in the early 1970's and later the dissolution of the former Soviet Union in 1991, were the driving forces behind the United States involvement in many places in the world in general, and in the most strategic, oil-rich Arabian Gulf in particular.

The United States military have intervened massively throughout the world since World War II and still do. In fact, as the most powerful nation in the world, the richest, and the most deeply involved, the United States world hegemony, the Pax Americana, and/or world leadership are the motives behind the United States global policy.

President John F. Kennedy once asked "What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war... not nearly peace in our time but peace in all time." This, on the other hand, is a sign of a new era of American intervention in the world affairs. President Kennedy stated that "We in this country, in this generation, are – by destiny rather than choice- the watchmen on the walls of world freedom." <sup>(12)</sup>

Yet, the United States idealistic approach for world leadership may not often be shared by the nations that feel the direct effect of the United States power. According to Ronald Steel (1970), in the words of the president of France Charles De Gaulle "The United States, delighting in her resources, feeling that she no longer had within herself

sufficient scope for her energies, wishing to help those who were in misery or bondage the world over, yielded in her turn to that task for intervention in which the instinct for domination cloaked itself." <sup>(13)</sup>

However, the former Soviet Union representing an ideology opposing to the United States and its western allies had led to confrontation with the United States, in what has come to be known as "East-West world order", with its related challenges from Arm Race, to Cold War, the Alliance System, the United Nations, and many other related issues have, in one way or another, limited the United States jumping horse from acting the way it did after the dissolution of the former Soviet Union in 1991. The 1990's brought along with it a sense of new world order, when the former Soviet Union officially announced the end of the Cold War, and so the old American dream was about to come true.

### **Justification of the 1990-1991 American War against Iraq:**

The 1990-1991 Gulf War was the starting point. President Bush termed his policy by going to War against Iraq as an attempt to establish what he called a new world order. Initially, many were confused and somehow excited by what Bush's new world order is. What he had meant by the term? Is it to establish a world system that will be more secure and stable than it was during the Cold War? Is it to promote justice, create and protect democracy in the world so the world will be a more peaceful place, in which the American interests will be served? Gradually, however, we realize that Bush's main objective was not to promote democracy and to appose aggression, but to promote conditions to achieve the American dream of world hegemony. The aftermath of the 1990-1991 Gulf War, and later the occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq, were in fact the turning point in the United States new world strategy. It seems very clear that the un-immediate cause of the 1990-1991 Gulf War was to promote condition of what president Bush described as "What we say goes" in the Gulf. <sup>(14)</sup>

The question that remains is what is new in Bush's new world order? In the wake of the Cold War, President Bush calls for America to take its place in a new world order? He was very insistent on the policy of "America Only". The "go- it alone" proposition was in fact what president Bush meant by "What we say goes". His very well known international views justify his refusal to the idea of "America First". World leadership in his perspective was to give the defense department alone the role to define the United States' role in the new world. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the aftermath of the 1990-1991 Gulf War together offered a new priority to the United States under the leadership of president Bush to detain the responsibility for addressing whoever threatens the United States' interests including its suitable new world order. <sup>(15)</sup>

According to Tareq Y. Ismael (1994), Bush's main objectives of going to war against Iraq in the 1990-1991 Gulf War were not to promote democracy but to re-establish hegemony in the region and to promote conditions of "What we say goes" in the Gulf. Ismael has argued on what was new in Bush's policy in the region that might be different from the restoration of the old political order as designed and structured by the Anglo-French colonial power. Was Bush's new policy an effort to bring about a new world order in the following senses? :

1) The denial of Soviet influence reduced the United States Soviet challenges in the region so that there were no more sources for Iraq to turn for military support and/or assistance. 2) The United States, which brought victory for the allied forces during World War II, established the United Nations in 1945. Since then, United States influence has gradually waned as smaller nations multiplied. The Gulf War marked a departure from these historical events and demonstrated to the world that the United States was again a super power to be reckoned with at the United Nations. The policy was a new order in the sense that, for the first time in history, President Bush placed enemies, Israel and its Arab neighbors, on one side against Iraq. 3) Bush demonstrated remarkable skill, enforcing his policy while successfully winning cooperation from many nations and eliminating his image as a "wimp". He was decisive and swift; it was a seemingly new Bush. Looking back at what he did in Panama and Nicaragua, however, we should have guessed what he might do in the world outside Eastern Europe. How much democracy prevails in Panama, Grenada, and Nicaragua today? How much assistance has the United States provided to those countries to establish democracy and political stability.<sup>(16)</sup>

As a result, however, Ismael had noted that, "Not much else is new about Bush's new world order, so why is this vital region, which contains over sixty percent of the world oil reserves, so unstable and subject to so many crises and wars of various magnitudes? According to Ismael, "It is unstable by design."<sup>(17)</sup>

Actually, it was in this content that the un-immediate causes of the United States direct involvement in the 1990-1991 War against Iraq had been carried out. The question of why the United States is at war with Iraq now, will be much easier to frame as what are not the reasons for the United States intervention in the Gulf than to provide a fully satisfactory account of its presence there. So it's fairly clear to specify the imperial goals, economic and political, that the United States wants to achieve through its involvement and direct intervention in the Gulf.

In fact the immediate causes of the American wars against Iraq come in the sense of United States as the leader of the world capitalism was acting aggressively and systematically to avoid economic recession world wide and its consequences at home. There two great oil shocks of the 1970's, the first was in 1973 as a result of the decision of the Arab Gulf states to impose a boycott on the sale of oil in reaction to the United States and Western supports to Israel, and second the Iranian revolution of 1979, increased the American determination to prevent any future disruption of its access to the Gulf oil. As George Friedman and Meredith Lebard (1991) have argued "With oil, the Persian Gulf becomes much more than a regional issue. It becomes the pivot of the world economy. For the United States, domination of the region would open the door on the possibility, unless the United States was prepared to wage a ground war in the region. The United States response to the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was explicitly for one purpose: preventing Iraqi domination of the region's oil supply. However, it opened up quite another possibility. Success of the United States in retaking Kuwait in 1991, breaking the Iraqi regime by the 2003 invasion of Iraq, and seizing control over Iraq would place the United States in control of a large amount of the world's oil reserves and production. No matter how benignly this power might be used, the United



States would emerge into control of the international economic system. It would be in a position to set production quotas and therefore prices, as well as control of oil shipment to any part of the world.<sup>(18)</sup>

Countries which are heavily dependent on the Gulf for its oil imports such as Japan, in addition to Western Europe and China would find themselves under direct control of the United States siege over the Gulf oil, especially after the invasion of Iraq in 2003. As a result, the leading power of the United States in the Gulf region has put it in a position where it can use this power to further gain an upper hand over the world economy.

This, on the other hand, might explain one of the immediate causes of the United States wars against Iraq since 1991 Gulf War to the 2003 American invasion of Iraq. Oil, in this case was the most immediate cause of the American wars in the region therefore preventing outside and/or regional power such as Iraq before 1991 and now Iran's control over the region was in fact the most obvious motive behind the United States future global strategies. The "go-it alone" and "what we say goes" in the Gulf have now been fully recognized.

#### **Justification of the 2003 American war against Iraq:**

Geoff Simons (2002) in his book "Targeting Iraq: Sanction and Bombing in United States Policy", stated that the long war against Iraq since 1991 had done nothing by sanctioning and bombing Iraq during the 1990's and after, to end the discussion whether the United States should have done more to overthrow the Iraqi regime. There are many who still believe that the United States should have continued moving toward Baghdad in 1991 to end once and for all the so called danger of the Iraqi regime.<sup>(19)</sup> Actually, the 1991 war justifications as maintained before are different from those of the 2003. The American justifications to go to war against Iraq in 2003 have been built on the fact that the aftermath of the 1991 war demanded a continuing and very costly military presence in the Gulf.

According to Adnan Hassan (2002), to keep Iraq under control, the United States has to employ much effort to prevent the Iraqis to recover from the 1991 war. This has required the United States to enforce sanctions in their different aspects, be ready to strike any time, keeping the Air Force, Ships, and more than twenty thousand military personnel stationed in the region in state of alert, which might cost the United States billions of dollars every year.<sup>20</sup> In addition, some might add that the growing complain of the regular citizen in the Gulf states, especially in Saudi Arabia regarding the foreign military presence in the region after the 1991 war would have an impact on the United States decision to move towards Iraq in order to station its military personnel and hardware. However, the American false allegations, stereotype and propaganda that have been used as a campaign to go to war against Iraq in 2003, have been severely criticized by many before and after the war. To justify their action, the American accusations were built on the following:

- 1) Iraq still hiding and developing weapons of mass destruction.

- 2) Saddam's regime still playing "Cat and Mouse" and "Hide and go seek" games with the United Nations inspection teams in Iraq.
- 3) Iraq was a threat to the U.S. and to world peace.
- 4) Saddam's regime had links with international terror; presumably Al-Qaeda. So the war on Iraq was part of the international war on terror. The 9/11/2001 event was used in this matter as one of the justifications of going to war.
- 5) Freeing the Iraqi people from the so called, brutal regime and setting Iraq as an example of promising democracy in the Middle East.<sup>(21)</sup>

As a result, the above mentioned assumptions can be used as the immediate causes of the American war against Iraq in 2003. In fact, there is no need to prove that the American accusations have no basis of any kind to convince anyone that they were correct. This can clearly be seen through the reality of the situation in Iraq since the first day of the invasion to the present time. So, did the Americans actually find any weapons of mass destruction? Was Iraq really a threat to the United States and world peace? Did the American intelligence, in any way, find a link between Saddam's regime and any terrorist organizations at any time, anywhere in the world? Are the Iraqi people free and secure now more than before? Is Iraq still united or has it been fragmented after the invasion. How much democracy do the Iraqi people enjoy today? Therefore, did America structurally design this war, and for what purpose? As a matter of fact, one can argue, that the 1991 war has its legal justifications based on the United Nations charter and the many Security Council resolutions issued against the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, including resolution 678 authorizing the use of military force to enforce Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. However, the case was completely different in 2003. No United Nations resolutions have been passed to give the United States a legal basis in its unilateral action against Iraq, with the exception of Britain's support. The American strive to go to war against Iraq in 2003 was built on false and unreal allegations of the Iraqi denial of the United Nations resolutions and cooperation with the inspectors, America also pushed to issue a new resolution to furnish the legal base to enforce compliance of the Iraqis and if not authorizing the use of force to do so, as it did in 1991. Accordingly, resolution 1441 issued by the United Nations Security Council on November 8, 2002 did not by any means authorize the use of force against Iraq. Quoting Madeline Albright, at the time United States Secretary of State, during the Clinton Administration, "Yet the sanctions themselves have been described as weapons of mass destruction. Even though members of the United States Administrations had admitted that Saddam Hussein had been contained and was no longer a threat, in 2002 and 2003, US President George Bush and UK Prime Minister attempted to convince the world that Iraq was a threat to the world and a mostly unpopular and illegal war (for not having United Nations authorization) was waged." She also added, "Around the world protests were immense. Saddam Hussein was eventually toppled though, but the aftermath has lead to insecurity in Iraq while fears of geopolitical interests by the US and UK for war are coming to surface. Furthermore, the justifications used by the US and UK for war are proving false, leading to implications of war crime."<sup>(22)</sup>

Friedman and Lebard (2002) have argued that, the unbalanced trade equation with Japan might explain the determination of the United States to gain control over the Gulf source of energy. The Arabian Gulf will necessarily become a center of controversy between the United States and Japan. Japan's vulnerability to the flow of oil from the area means that increased United States power in the region must increase Japanese insecurity. The regionalization of conflict and the regional segmentation of economies will open an important door for the United States: the manipulation of Japan's oil supply could well end the challenge that Japanese exports pose to the United States.<sup>(23)</sup>

However, the United States Cold War military strategy demanded a massive military build-up against the former Soviet Union before 1991, had increased aggressiveness of the American foreign policy and its internationalism. The victory over Iraq in the 1991 Gulf War and the dissolution of the former Soviet Union in 1991 created the opportunity for the United States to establish unchallenged world hegemony. Therefore the United States global strategy should be carried out in this manner. According to Charles Krauthammer (1991) the United States should not hesitate to use military power to get what ever it wants.<sup>(24)</sup> This American militarism that had been exercised against Iraq, both in 1991 and 2003 wars became the guiding policy of the United States as its right to use military force anywhere in the world, at any time, against any country it believes may become a threat to it or challenge its interests. As David North (2002) pointed out, global hegemony or world domination is now being made by the United States in the since of that the United States asserts the right to bomb, invade and destroy whatever country it chooses, as in the case of the continuation of the American war against Iraq since 1991 until the present day. It refuses to respect as a matter of international law the sovereignty of any other country and reserves the right to get rid of any regime, as it had done in Iraq against Saddam Hussein, in any part of the world, that is, appears to be or might some day become hostile to what the United States considers as in its vital interests.<sup>(25)</sup>

United States threats are directed in the short term, against so called "failed states". Those failed states, in the American dictionary, may include any state in the whole world. The way the US had treated the former leader of Iraq, the late Saddam Hussein, is in fact a very aggressive and immediate signal to those who might, at any time, oppose or disagree with the United States. Unfortunately the United States has placed itself as the world policeman, the judge and the jury who can decide the fate of any leader at any time in any less fortunate nation in the world. In addition, the United States is now using its influence in the world to further dictate its values in an arrogant way over nations around the world. President Bush, the father, once said "America's values are right and true for every person in every society."<sup>(26)</sup>

Accordingly, an arrogant propaganda campaign carried out by the United States after the invasion of Iraq in 2003 that the American role in the new world, without Saddam's Iraq, will be the so called democratization of the Middle East and at the end a more peaceful world in general. However, one should be careful though in the interpretation of democracy in the region. It actually means democracy subordinate to the United States values and interests. The situation inside Iraq after five years of complete American control over the country proves that the suitable American

democracy in Iraq was superiority, control, and influence over not only Iraq, but also the region at large. The American " Tanks democracy" as most people in the Arab world referred to, was in fact practiced by the United States as a military coop against the leader of Iraq to place those who are in favor of the United States into positions of power in Iraq. This has also served to keep the people of Iraq at bay for a long time to come in the name of liberating them from oppressive dictatorship in return. In fact there is no need to mention that the common theme of the United States sense of lying and fighting in Iraq was, the strive to fully control access to the resources of the country.

### Findings

There are many questions that have been raised by most of those who are still uncertain of why America is at war with Iraq? However, the author in this study tried to elaborate on the already mentioned explanations suggested so far by scholars, academics, political and economic columnists in their efforts to reveal the immediate and un-immediate causes of the United States wars against Iraq since the 1991 Gulf War to the 2003 American invasion of Iraq.

The issue of Iraq has played a significant role in world politics since 1991. The first American war against Iraq in 1991 occurred just a few months before the collapse of the former Soviet Union. Therefore when Iraq invaded Kuwait in August the second 1990, the American response to the crisis was limited to retaking Kuwait, protecting Saudi Arabia and the other Gulf States from further attacks by Iraq, reducing the Iraqi military capabilities, not to appose threat to the region in the nearest future, and finally securing the free flow of the regions oil. Yet the victory over Iraq in 1991 did in fact achieve the immediate objectives of the United States at the time, however, with Saddam still in power after the war, the United States unfinished business in the Gulf has been questioned since then. Why did America have to come back later and recapture Iraq? What was the hiding agenda of the United States since then? Was Iraq after the 1991 war still considered by the United States as a hostile state that might act again? This, accordingly, might explain the consequences and the aftermath of the 1991 war against Iraq in the following senses: 1) with the fate of the former Soviet Union still unknown the United States strategy makers considered it too risky to avoid the United Nation Mandate and hesitated to act unilaterally to go farther in its war against Iraq in 1991, and its quest to overthrow the regime in Baghdad. 2) Cooperation with the former Soviet Union before, during, and after the war has been carefully calculated by the policy makers in the United States to further guarantee the application of the United Nations Resolution against Iraq. 3) Despite the fact that the war in 1991 had broken the backbone of the Iraqi military, the regime in Baghdad still practicing control over the fragments in Iraq as it did against the Shiite in the South and the Kurds in the North right after the war, in addition to Saddam's secret agencies still actively in charge of keeping the country under Baghdad's control. 4) Enforcing the United Nations Resolutions, mainly sanctions was another tactic used by the United States to do what the war hadn't done to the Iraqi military and technological capabilities. Disarming Iraq from so called weapons of mass destruction has been significantly achieved by enforcing the United Nations Resolution against Iraq. 5) Using a long term calculated

strategy, in dealing with Iraq after the 1991 war has been successfully carried out by the United States since the end of the war until the decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

The unfinished war against Iraq within this context can be analyzed in the sense that the United States policy before the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union was surrounded with the continuation of the Cold War era. However, after 1991, the United States role in the world has dramatically changed. The emergence of the United States as the world's unchallenged power at the end of the Cold War, and its victory over Iraq in 1991 created a new dimension to the United States role in the world. This has increased the "America only" and the "Go it alone" policy adopted by the leadership of the United States. The unfinished business with Iraq should come to an end. Between 1991 and 2003 the situation in Iraq was structurally designed by the United States as an open ended tactic to be completed in the 2003 American invasion of Iraq, and the overthrow of Saddam's regime. According to Adnan Hassan (2002), the United States continued effort to weaken Iraq after the 1991 war, comes from the fears that Iraq might still be capable to strike again. Therefore efforts must continue to eliminate Iraqi threats by all means. Using American allegations, that despite what the 1991 war did against the Iraqi military, the Iraqi's still have the ability to threaten Kuwait and Saudi Arabia by its remaining military power, especially the very well trained and equipped Republican Guards, in addition to the accusations of Iraqi's capabilities of producing weapons of mass destruction. Therefore sanctions against Iraq must be enforced. The United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 that imposed on Iraq eliminating it from producing ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction including chemical and biological weapons has been used by the United States to continue bombing Iraq, impose the no-fly zone in North and Southern Iraq, titan economic sanction and more, all has been structurally and systematically planed to prepare Iraq to be an easy target for the United States, which was proven as a successful tactic in the 2003 war against Iraq.<sup>(27)</sup>

As the argument still going on about why America invaded Iraq. There is a great deal of debate among scholars, political analysts, and in the mind of most people regarding the causes of this war. It seems that there is a wide variety of motives and arguments for justifying the war which have been presented by both pro-war and anti-war camps since the 2003 invasion of Iraq. As mentioned before in this study the publicly announced motives and/or justifications that were presented by the United States officials at the time have all been proven false and have nothing to do with the stated aims of the United States. So, was President Bush, the son taking his country to war over lies? Some might argue that since no weapons of mass destruction have been found, no Iraqi links with Al-Qaeda or 9/11<sup>th</sup> events and the quick victory over Iraq in 2003 all have proven that Iraq's military capability was not a threat, so was the war fought to achieve other assumed and/or unspoken objectives such as :

1. Securing control over the Iraqi oil resources.
2. Creating a huge market for American investors in a populated rich country.
3. Addressing those who are wrong, in the American dictionary, and supporting those who are not.

4. Exercising a military hegemony and so world domination.
5. Breaking up present and any future Arab coalitions against Israel.
6. A large amount of United States military presence near by will send a strong signal to Iran and Syria, and will ensure at the end the security of Israel.
7. Avoiding any smooth and healthy relations between Iraq and its Arab- Gulf neighboring countries.
8. Favorable location of the central position of Iraq, close to central Asia, so that Iraq and Afghanistan will make a strong strategic geopolitical interest to the United States.
9. And finally, presumably the removal of a large number of American troops from Saudi Arabia to Iraq might reduce the so called Muslim sensibilities then eliminating growing American resistance by Muslims who consider Saudi Arabia as a holly place for Muslims all over the world.<sup>(28)</sup>

Despite all arguments of what causes war in general and the justifications of the United States wars against Iraq in 1991 and the following years, and the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the economic aspects of power always come into play in the United States overall policy towards the Gulf region at large. As Howard J. Wiadra has pointed out "As American economic problems begin to mount in the 1980's, the prospect of a major oil crisis was hardly welcome. The fear of a major disruption in the flow of the Gulf oil, during a period of greater dependency and worsening American economic problems, would severely undermine United States capability to wield the economic instrument of statecraft."<sup>(29)</sup> In addition a prospect of future oil interruption would severely affect the military power and as a result will affect the security interest of the United States. American national security strategists began to warn in general terms that the identification of threats to United States interest was marked by uncertainty and ambiguity. These fears come from that United States interests might be posed by increasingly better-armed regional power, so that the United States should be prepared for any threat that might occur in any time. Therefore the United States response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990 was carried out within this context<sup>(30)</sup>

Accordingly, to further advance its national interests and protect them from threats, the United States pursued a number of identifiable regional objectives that include resisting by all means aggressive behavior by any regime in the region that might oppose threat to the United States interests. As a result the Iraqi issue remains an important part of larger challenges and opportunities that constitute the present and future American agenda in the Gulf region.<sup>(31)</sup>

## Conclusion

It's quite clear that the United States' engagement in a hostile situation with Iraq from 1991 to 2003 has been far from the fact that this engagement was to stop the Iraqi violation of the principle of the international law, to stop aggression and reckless acts of the former Iraqi leader, and to ensue peace and security in the region. However, the United State policy toward Iraq since 1991 until its occupation in 2003 was based on

the fact that the United States national interests in the region was the driving force behind its direct involvement in an actual war with Iraq. There is always a gap between principles and actual policy. Therefore, the questions addressed in this study have now been answered throughout the text by identifying the immediate and un-immediate causes of the American wars against Iraq. Although, the questions of why, where, and where to are in support to the author's argument that the United States did in fact structurally design wars in the Gulf in the since of models assumption. As mentioned before the two basic models that have been used in this study first as an actor-oriented model that looks for violence carried out by actors which in this case, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, and second, a structure-oriented model that focuses on systematic conditions that are responsible for occurrence of direct military action in which the American actions against Iraq in both 1991 and 2003 have been analyzed within this context. At the end, we can conclude that the United States did in fact structurally, systematically, and deliberately, create conditions in the Gulf built one many alleged claims and unreal excuses and causes to legitimize its wars against Iraq from 1991-2003.

#### Foot-Notes

Galtung, Johan (1980). *The True Words: A Transnational Perspective*. New York: Free Press. P.179. In Tareq Ismael, and Jacqueline S. Ismael. (1994). *The Gulf War And The New World Order*. Florida University Press: p.52.

Tareq Y. Ismael, and Jacqueline S. Ismael.(1994). *The Gulf War And The New World Order*. University Press of Florida, U.S.A. p.52.

Walter S. Jones (1988). *The Logic of International Relations*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., Scott, Foresman and Company, U.S.A.,p.406.

Hidemi Suganami (1991) *The Causes of War: A New Theoretical Framework in William Clinton Olson (1991).The Theory And Practice of International Relations*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed., Prentice Hall, Englewood, New Jersey, U.S.A. p.230.

Donald Neef (1991), *How and Why the US turned against Iraq*. In *Middle East International*, 22 February 1991, p.19-20.

Ander Gunder Frank (1992). *Third World War: A Political Economy of the Gulf War and the New World Order*. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol.13. No.2., p.271.

*Ibid*, p.271.

Pierre Salinger and Eric Laurent (1991). *Secret Dossier, The Hidden Agenda Behind The Gulf War*, Clays Ltd, St Ives. plc, England.p.72.

*Ibid*.p72.

Frank, Op cit, p.271.

*Ibid*, p.272.

Ronald Steel(1967). *Pax Americana*, The Viking Press, New York, U.S.A. p.vii-3

*Ibid*, p.3.

Ibid, p.5.

"America Only", editorial, New York Times, 10 March 1992.p.A24 L.

Ismael, p.53-4.

Ibid, p.54.

David North (2002) "The war against Iraq and America's drive for world domination" World Socialists Web Site, The International Committee of the Forth International, October 4,2002, p.2.

جيف سيمونز (2002)، استهداف العراق، العقوبات والغارات في السياسة الأمريكية. ترجمة مركز دراسات الوحدة العربية، بيروت، لبنان (2004)، ص33.

مايكل كلير (2001) الحرب على الموارد، الجغرافيا الجديدة للنزاعات العالمية، ترجمة عدنان حسن دار الكتاب العربي، بيروت، لبنان ص.82. انظر أيضاً، العناني خليل (2003) 'دور النفط في الأزمة الأمريكية العراقية، السياسة الدولية 151 ، يناير 2003، ص32

جيف سيمونز (2003) ، عراق المستقبل، السياسة الأمريكية في إعادة تشكيل الشرق الأوسط. ترجمة سعيد العظم، بيروت، لبنان، 2004، ص18.

"The Iraqi Crisis", [www.global issues.org](http://www.global issues.org) . Wednesday, August 1, 2007.

Ibid, p.6.

Foreign Affairs, vol.70, no.1, 1991, p.33.

North, p.15.

Ibid, p.16.

كلير، ص83

"Why did America Invade Iraq", [www.global issues.org](http://www.global issues.org). May ,2005.

Howard J. Wiarda (1996), U.S. Foreign and Strategic Policy in the Post-Cold War Era, A Geopolitical Perspective, Greenwood Press, London, p.121.

Ibid, p.121-2.

O'Neill Bard E. and Ilana Kass (1993) "The Persian Gulf War: A Political-Military Assessment" in the Middle East after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, Robert O. Freedman (ed.) Gainesville: University Press of Florida, p.17.



### **Additional References**

- Charles Krauthammer(columnist).(1991)"unipolar moment". Foreign Affairs, vol.70, no.1, 1991, p.33.
- Don L. Mansfield, Gary J. Buckley (1985), Conflict in American Foreign Policy, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, USA.
- "Excerpts From Pentagon's Plan: Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival," NYT, 8 March 1992.
- John Simpson (1991). From The House of War, arrow Books Limited, London.
- Michael E. Brow and others (ed.) (1998), Theories of War and Peace, the MIT Press Cambridge, Mass, USA.
- Miller, Lynn H. (1985). Global Order: Values and Power in International Politics. Boulder, Colorado: West view Press, U.S.A.
- Nadav Safran (1992) Dimensions of the Middle East Problem: Before and After the Gulf War. In, Roy C. Macridis, Foreign Policy in world Politics, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, USA.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr., and Roger K. Smith, ed.,(1992). After the Storm: Lessons From the Gulf War. Lanham, Md.: Madison Box.
- Oye, Kenneth A. et al., ed.,( 1992). Eagle in a New World: American Grand Strategy in the Post-Cold War Era. Harper Collins Publishers.
- Patrick Tyler, "War in 1990s: New Doubts. Pentagon Plans Evoke Skepticism in Congress," NYT, 18 February 1992.
- Phebe Marr, and William Lewis (1993) Riding the Tiger. The Middle East Challenge After the Cold War, West view press ,U.S.A.
- Ramsay, William C., (1993). " Oil in the 1990's: The Gulf Dominant." In Riding the Tiger: The Middle East Challenge After the Cold War, ed., Phebe Marr and William Lewis. Boulder: West view Press.
- Rezun, Miron (1992). Intrigue and War in Southwest Asia: The Struggle For Supremacy from Central Asia to Iraq. New York: Prager.
- Robert Brenner, (1991). "Why is the United States at War with Iraq?" New Left Review 185.
- Robert O. Freeman, Editor (1993). The Middle East after Iraq's Invasion of Kuwait, University Press of Florida, U.S.A.
- Saikal, Amin., (1992). "The United States and the Persian Gulf Security." World Policy Journal, 9, No.3.
- Snow, Donald M., (1993). Distant Thunder: Third World Conflict and New International Order. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Stein, Janice Gross., (1988-89). "The Wrong Strategy in the Right Place, The united states in the Persian Gulf." International Security 13, No.3.

Tyler Patrick (1992). "U.S Strategy Plan Calls For Insuring Rivals Develop: A One Super Power World," New York Times.

أحمد شرف (1992)، مسيرة النظام الدولي الجديد قبل وبعد حرب الخليج، دار الثقافة الجديدة، القاهرة.

خليل العناني (2003)، دور النفط في الأزمة الأمريكية-العراقية، السياسة الدولية، العدد 151، يناير 2003.

شريف بسيوني (2003)، الحرب الأمريكية في العراق : مشروعية استخدام القوة، السياسة الدولية، العدد 151، يناير 2003.